

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/511,057	10/12/2004	Hubert Baumgart	PAT-00293 2264			
26922 BASF CORPO	7590 09/21/2007 RATION		EXAMINER			
Patent Department			CHEUNG, WILLIAM K			
1609 BIDDLE AVENUE MAIN BUILDING			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WYANDOTTE	WYANDOTTE, MI 48192			1713		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			09/21/2007	ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LORI.HASS@BASF.COM MARJORIE.ELLIS@BASF.COM ANNE.SABOURIN@BASF.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/511,057	BAUMGART ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
William K. Cheung	1713

			1				
	William K. Cheung	1713					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 September 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	•				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in a	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compailing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS	,	(.,					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,.					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **		(DTO) 004				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	·	41	4 !' 4b -				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be anon-allowable claim(s). 		•	-				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.	•						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	-		-				
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	10 m	7,8/07	1				
WILLIAM K. CHEUNG PRIMARY EXAMPLED							
	""' SAMMET)					

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to the specification introduces new issues or new matters that would require further consideration and/or search by the examiner.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants aruge that the Voris et al. is not available for rejection under 102(e)-103 rejection set forth in view of the priority document filed October 12, 2004. However, applicants fail to recognize that the priority document of October 12, 2004 must be translated into the English language in order to claim the priority date of April 24, 2002, as argued. Regarding applicants' argument that Voris et al. only teach six possible crosslinks, not all six type of crosslinks in the same composition, applicants fail to recognize that Voris et al. teach six different possible crosslinks, which means that all type of crosslinks are present in the disclosed composition, however, at different amounts. Applicants must recognize that the amount of each type of crosslinks in the disclosed composition would be dependent on the amount of different functional groups available for reaction, the kinetics, and the thermodynamics of the crosslinking reaction under the crosslinking conditions disclosed. That is, the type of crosslinks that is favorable under a particular reaction condition will be at higher percentage as compared to the type of crosslinks that is less favorable under the same reaction or crosslinking condition would be at a lower percentage. Therefore, the rationale set forth for the rejection is proper. Regarding applicants' argument that Voris et al. do not teach "a thixotropic agent", applicants fail to recognize that in view of the substantially identical composition of Voris et al. and the composition as claimed, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the claimed "thixotropic agent" feature is inherently possessed in Voris et al. In view of the reasons set forth above, the 102-3 rejection set forth is maintain.

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER